

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	A PERSONAL PROPERTY AND A SECOND PROPERTY OF THE PERSON AND A SECO	CONFIRMATION NO.
APPLICATION NO.	PILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/724,521	11/28/2003	Christopher M. Warnock	EBRY003	8904
22862 7590 05/02/2008 GLENN PATENT GROUP 3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L			EXAMINER	
			RASHID, DAVID	
MENLO PARK, CA 94025			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2624	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/02/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/724.521 WARNOCK ET AL. Examiner Art Unit DAVID P RASHID 2624

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) <u>DAVID P. RASHID (examiner)</u> .	(3) Juliet Hurt .				
(2) <u>Michael Glenn (Reg. No. 30,176)</u> .	(4)Chirs Radcliffe.				
Date of Interview: 30 April 2008.					
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant	2) applicant's representative]				
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e)⊠ No.				
Claim(s) discussed: 1.					
Identification of prior art discussed: Wang et al. (US 5,680,479).					
Agreement with respect to the claims f) $\hfill \square$ was reached.	g) was not reached. h) \square N/A.				

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' representative discussed the newly added limitations and how they are distinguishable from the prior art of record, including the mapping, presenting, and analyzing steps of claim 1 outlined in Attachment A. Though no agreement was reached as to whether the newly added limitations overcome the prior art of record, the examiner agreed to take the applicants' representive's argument into consideration when looking at the newly added limitations.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Vikkram Bali/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, 2624

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Examiner's signature, if required Attachment to a signed Office action.